

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Tahreem Khan	Team: Squad #11	CCRB Case #: 201907703	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 08/27/2019 10:00 PM	Location of Incident: In front of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn	Precinct: 79	18 Mo. SOL 2/27/2021	EO SOL 10/14/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 08/29/2019 10:51 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 08/29/2019 10:51 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Anthony Bomparola	15054	955761	079 PCT
2. POM Anthony Davila	14220	956571	079 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola stopped § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila stopped § 87(2)(b)	
C.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola frisked § 87(2)(b)	
D.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila frisked § 87(2)(b)	
E.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola searched § 87(2)(b)	
F.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila searched § 87(2)(b)	
G.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola questioned § 87(2)(b)	
H.POM Anthony Bomparola	Force: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
I.POM Anthony Davila	Force: Police Officer Anthony Davila used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
J.POM Anthony Bomparola	Discourtesy: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
K.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	
L.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	
M.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
N.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	
O.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	
P.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
Q.POM Anthony Davila	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Davila failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		

Case Summary

On August 29, 2019, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via telephone.

On August 27, 2019, at approximately 10 p.m., in front of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola and Police Office Anthony Davila, both of the 79th Precinct, stopped § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**), both officers allegedly frisked (**Allegations C and D: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**) and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations E and F: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Bomparola allegedly questioned § 87(2)(b) regarding a weapon and used physical force against him (**Allegations G: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**; **Allegation H: Force, § 87(2)(g)**). With PO Bomparola, PO Davila also allegedly used physical force against § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation I: Force, § 87(2)(g)**).

PO Bomparola allegedly spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation J: Discourtesy, § 87(2)(g)**).

In addition, PO Bomparola and PO Davila refused to provide their names to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations K and L: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**) and refused to provide their shield numbers to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations M and N: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Davila threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations O: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Bomparola and PO Davila failed to provide their Right to Know Act (RTKA) cards to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations P and Q: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) was neither arrested nor issued a summons as a result of this incident.

There was no Body-Worn Camera (BWC) footage because PO Bomparola and PO Davila did not turn on their body-worn cameras.

Video footage was obtained from § 87(2)(b) which was sent to him by § 87(2)(b) and obtained from § 87(2)(b) who witnessed the incident. The footage only captures the second half of the incident, starting from Allegation H and will be discussed in further detail below.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola stopped § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila stopped § 87(2)(b)

There is no video footage for this portion of the incident.

The investigation established the following facts:

On August 27, 2019, at approximately 10 p.m., outside of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn, § 87(2)(b) stood alone at the curb on the sidewalk, with his family members, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) standing a few feet behind him. PO Bomparola and PO Davila were driving by in a tan colored Ford vehicle, when they decided to approach § 87(2)(b). The rest of the details of the initial encounters are in dispute.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) testified that he held a black LG cell phone in his hand as he walked to the curb of the street to spit. Without any prior conversation, PO Bomparola and PO Davila approached § 87(2)(b) and PO Davila asked § 87(2)(b) what was in his hand. § 87(2)(b) told PO Davila that he could see what was in his hand. PO Bomparola and PO Davila then grabbed § 87(2)(b) frisked him, and searched within his pants pockets.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) stated that without mentioning a word to § 87(2)(b) PO Bomparola and PO Davila approached § 87(2)(b) at which point he began to move away from the officers. PO Bomparola grabbed § 87(2)(b) and frisked him by feeling along his legs. Both PO Bomparola and PO Davila then searched within § 87(2)(b)'s pants pockets. After frisking and searching § 87(2)(b) PO Bomparola asked him where the gun was.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) testified that PO Bomparola and PO Davila approached § 87(2)(b) without making any statements. After approaching, PO Davila told § 87(2)(b) to back up and then asked what was in his hand. Both PO Bomparola and PO Davila grabbed § 87(2)(b) frisked him and searched within his pants pockets. PO Bomparola stated multiple times that § 87(2)(b) appeared to have a weapon on him.

PO Davila (BR 05) testified that he observed § 87(2)(b) for one or two minutes. During that time, § 87(2)(b) made eye contact with PO Davila and made statements that PO Davila could not understand. PO Davila felt that § 87(2)(b)'s behavior was not that of a "normal" person but may have been that of someone in psychiatric crisis. As such, he was unsure if § 87(2)(b) had taken his psychiatric medication, if he had any. PO Davila further stated that there are sometimes emotionally disturbed individuals around that area. PO Davila and PO Bomparola exited their vehicle and approached § 87(2)(b) to see if he was alright. Once the officers began to approach, § 87(2)(b) began to back away, ball his hands into fists, squeeze them tight, shake his fists, and curse, but was not able to recall what § 87(2)(b) was saying. PO Davila stood about an arm's length away from § 87(2)(b). PO Davila recalled trying to calm § 87(2)(b) down, but did not recall how he tried to do so.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola frisked § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila frisked § 87(2)(b)

Davila frisked § 87(2)(b) is in dispute.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that PO Bomparola and PO Davila grabbed § 87(2)(b) and felt around his waist, shoulder area, and around his back. As the officers grabbed § 87(2)(b) he slapped their hands away each time they touched him.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) stated that PO Bomparola grabbed § 87(2)(b) by the waistband on his pants and then started to pat down § 87(2)(b)'s legs along the seams of his pants. § 87(2)(b) did not mention seeing PO Davila also frisking § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) testified that PO Bomparola and PO Davila patted down § 87(2)(b) between his legs, around his waistline, and his back area.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) and PO Davila (BR 05) denied ever frisking § 87(2)(b).

A request for the Stop, Question and Frisk Log (BR 17) from the precinct of occurrence for the date of this incident was met with negative results.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola searched § 87(2)(b).

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila searched § 87(2)(b).

There is no video footage for this portion of the incident. Whether PO Bomparola and PO Davila searched § 87(2)(b) is in dispute.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that after PO Bomparola and PO Davila frisked him, they also searched within his pants pockets.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) testified that PO Bomparola and PO Davila searched § 87(2)(b) around his groin area, around his buttocks, his inter-gluteal cleft, and inside of his pants pockets.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that PO Bomparola and PO Davila searched § 87(2)(b) within his pants pockets.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) and PO Davila (BR 05) denied searching § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola questioned § 87(2)(b).

There is no video footage that captures this portion of the incident.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) testified that when PO Bomparola and PO Davila initially approached him, PO Davila asked § 87(2)(b) multiple times regarding what he had in his hand. § 87(2)(b) did not allege PO Bomparola asking him any question regarding a weapon.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) stated that while PO Bomparola pulled § 87(2)(b) by the waistband of his pants and asked § 87(2)(b) where a gun was.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that after PO Bomparola and PO Davila exited their vehicle, they asked § 87(2)(b) what was in his pants and in his hand, without specifying what they were referring to. After PO Bomparola frisked § 87(2)(b) PO Bomparola told § 87(2)(b) that he appeared to have a weapon. Towards the end of the interaction, PO Bomparola, again, stated to § 87(2)(b) that he seemed to have a gun. § 87(2)(b) told PO Bomparola that he had his phone on him.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) testified that when he exited his vehicle, he saw an object in § 87(2)(b)'s right hand, which appeared to be a cell phone. PO Bomparola then observed § 87(2)(b) put his right hand behind his back and slip the object into his back-left pants pocket. PO Bomparola found this behavior to be strange and while he thought the object was a cell phone, PO Bomparola was not sure because it was dark outside. Other than the aforementioned behavior by § 87(2)(b) PO Bomparola had no other reason to believe that § 87(2)(b) had a weapon on him. Although PO Bomparola spoke with § 87(2)(b) he did not recall the substance of their conversation.

PO Davila (BR 05) did not recall what he said to § 87(2)(b) or what § 87(2)(b) said to him. PO Davila also did not recall if he suspected § 87(2)(b) of a crime at the time. PO Davila did not recall what PO Bomparola was doing at the time.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) provided the investigation with video footage of the incident taken by § 87(2)(b) (BR 06). This video only captures this allegation. All timestamps noted refer to the point in the video player where each respective event occurs. At the 00:04 mark, PO Bomparola takes a step closer to § 87(2)(b) swats PO Bomparola's hand away, and PO Bomparola pushes § 87(2)(b) with one hand. His hand makes contact with the center of § 87(2)(b)'s chest and causes § 87(2)(b) to take two steps back.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that while PO Bomparola and PO Davila frisked and searched him, the officers also "strong-armed" him and backed him up from the curb to the wall. § 87(2)(b) was unable to further explain what he meant by the term "strong-arming." § 87(2)(b) also stated that when PO Bomparola and PO Davila grabbed § 87(2)(b) as they were frisking and searching him. Each time the officers grabbed § 87(2)(b) he swatted the officers' hands away.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) testified that as § 87(2)(b) tried to step away from the officers, PO Bomparola pulled § 87(2)(b) by the waistband and brought § 87(2)(b) closer to him. § 87(2)(b)'s phone began to ring, so he began to reach towards his back pocket to answer his phone and show the officers that he only had a phone. PO Bomparola extended his arm and pushed § 87(2)(b) in the chest hard with one hand. § 87(2)(b) then pushed PO Bomparola's hand away.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03), like § 87(2)(b) stated that PO Bomparola and PO Davila pushed § 87(2)(b) from the curb towards the building of § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) did not provide additional details on how the officer's pushed § 87(2)(b)

Initially, in his CCRB interview, PO Bomparola (BR 04) denied pushing § 87(2)(b) After viewing the video footage above, PO Bomparola amended his testimony to reflect that he pushed § 87(2)(b) to increase distance between the two of them as a safety measure. PO Bomparola (BR 04) stated that because § 87(2)(b)'s arms were below PO Bomparola, he could have hit PO Bomparola with an uppercut blow.

PO Davila (BR 05) testified that he did not observe PO Bomparola use any force against § 87(2)(b)

Officers may use force when it is reasonable for the protection of an officer or of other individuals present. NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 221-01 (BR 07).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila used physical force against

§ 87(2)(b)

There is no video footage that captures this allegation.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that PO Bomparola and PO Davila pushed § 87(2)(b) from the curb where he initially stood in front of their apartment building.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that PO Bomparola and PO Davila “strong-armed” him while they frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) who was not able to expand on the type of force the officers used.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) did not make an allegation of PO Davila using force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

PO Davila (BR 05) denied pushing § 87(2)(b)

PO Bomparola (BR 04) corroborated PO Davila’s denial.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola spoke discourteously to

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) provided the investigation with video footage of the incident that she took on her cell phone (BR 08). This video only captures the second half of the incident and captures this allegation. Between the 00:25 and the 00:33 mark in the video, § 87(2)(b) told PO Bomparola that he put his hands on him. PO Bomparola responded, “I’m allowed to.” PO Bomparola did not use profanity during this video, which captures the conclusion of the incident.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) stated that PO Bomparola told § 87(2)(b) that he had the “fucking” right to touch him.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) recalled that an officer told him that he had the right to touch him, however, he did not make any statements regarding an officer using profanity towards him.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) did not hear an officer use profanity towards § 87(2)(b)

PO Bomparola (BR 04) and PO Davila (BR 05) denied using profanity towards § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his name to

Allegation (L) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila refused to provide his name to

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that after he told the officers that they did not have the right to touch him, he asked PO Bomparola and PO Davila for their names. At no point did either officer provide their names to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) corroborated § 87(2)(b)’s testimony regarding these allegations.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that after PO Bomparola and PO Davila searched § 87(2)(b) he asked for both officers’ names. Later, after § 87(2)(b) told PO Bomparola that he had his phone in his hand, § 87(2)(b) again, asked for PO Bomparola and PO Davila’s names. Neither officers provided their names

PO Bomparola (BR 04) and PO Davila (BR 05) did not recall if § 87(2)(b) asked for their names.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (M) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (N) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) recorded the video footage located in IA12 (BR 06). This video only captured the last half of the interaction. Between the 00:00 mark and the 00:04 mark on the media player, § 87(2)(b) faced PO Bomparola and asked for his shield number. Between the 00:06 mark and the 00:10 mark, § 87(2)(b) first faced PO Bomparola, asked for his shield number twice, and then turned to face PO Davila and asked for his shield number. Between the 00:21 to the 00:24 mark, § 87(2)(b) asked PO Bomparola for his shield number. During this section, § 87(2)(b) spoke coherently, without any slurred speech. § 87(2)(b) did not step towards the officers until they were leaving. While interacting with the officers, § 87(2)(b) did not make any threats. § 87(2)(b) either kept his hands flat and visible in the video or closed his hands when he was pointing at the officers. § 87(2)(b) does not appear to ball his hands into fists or shake closed fists at any point. At no point in this video did PO Bomparola or PO Davila provide their shield numbers to § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b) recorded the video located in IA 57 (BR 08). Between the 00:00 mark to the 00:03 mark, § 87(2)(b) asked PO Bomparola for his shield number. Between the 00:03 mark and the 00:04 mark, § 87(2)(b) turned to PO Davila and asked him for his shield number. Between the 00:17 mark to the 00:20 mark, § 87(2)(b) again, asked for PO Bomparola's shield number.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that after he told the officers that they did not have the right to touch him, he asked PO Bomparola and PO Davila for their names and for their shield numbers. At no point did either officer provide the information requested.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) testified that § 87(2)(b) asked both PO Bomparola and PO Davila for their shield numbers multiple times. Neither of the officers provided their shield numbers.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that after PO Bomparola and PO Davila searched § 87(2)(b) he asked for both officers shield numbers. Neither of the officers provided their shield numbers.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) testified that he recalled § 87(2)(b) asking for his shield number multiple times, but because § 87(2)(b)'s behavior was becoming violent and was "not mentally present" in the situation, PO Bomparola did not provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b). PO Bomparola saw § 87(2)(b) make eye contact with him for ten to fifteen seconds and then stated, "You're going to get it." PO Bomparola then believed that there was something wrong with § 87(2)(b) or thought that he was intoxicated. When asked why PO Bomparola thought there was something wrong with § 87(2)(b) PO Bomparola was unable to expand of the details of § 87(2)(b)'s behavior. Rather, PO Bomparola stated that he was not a doctor, which is why he did not know what was wrong with § 87(2)(b) but he perceived § 87(2)(b)'s behavior to deviate from that of a healthy person. PO Bomparola did not provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b) as it was not safe for him to do so because he felt that § 87(2)(b)'s behavior was growing more violent and because he was not "mentally there." PO Bomparola provided only those two reasons why he felt unsafe. During PO Bomparola's interview, the investigation presented the video footage located in IA 12 (BR 06). After reviewing the video, PO Bomparola reiterated that he did not provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b) because he did not feel safe in that situation.

PO Davila (BR 05) could not recall if § 87(2)(b) asked him for his shield number. During PO Davila's interview, he viewed the video in IA 57 (BR 08). After reviewing the footage,

PO Davila still did not independently recall § 87(2)(b) asking for his and PO Bomparola's shield numbers. PO Davila stated that if he did not provide his shield number, then it was because he was trying to leave the area as soon as possible. After viewing the footage for a second time upon his request, PO Davila amended his testimony and stated that he did not recall § 87(2)(b) asking for his shield number.

Officers should clearly state their name, rank, shield number and command to anyone who requests it. NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 (BR 09).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (O) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b).

In the video located in IA 12 (BR 06) between the 00:09 mark and the 00:10 mark on the media player, PO Davila asked § 87(2)(b) if he wanted to get "locked up." From another angle in the video located in IA 57 (BR 08), between the 00:04 mark and the 00:06 mark, PO Davila asked § 87(2)(b) if he wanted to "get locked up" after § 87(2)(b) asked for PO Davila's shield number.

During his interview, § 87(2)(b) (BR 01) did not allege that PO Davila threatened to arrest him. During his interview, § 87(2)(b) viewed the video located IA 12 (BR 06), but he did not make any amendments to his initial testimony.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 02) testified that after § 87(2)(b) asked for PO Bomparola and PO Davila's shield numbers, PO Davila told § 87(2)(b) to calm down, put his hands down, and then asked if he wanted to be arrested.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 03) stated that after § 87(2)(b) told both PO Bomparola and PO Davila that they were violating his rights, PO Davila asked § 87(2)(b) if he wanted to be arrested.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) did not recall whether PO Davila threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

PO Davila (BR 05) testified that as PO Bomparola and PO Davila approached § 87(2)(b) he balled his hands into fists, squeezed them tight, shook them, and cursed, which PO Davila interpreted as a threat. Before seeing the video, PO Davila did not recall if he threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b). During PO Davila's interview, the investigation played the video located in IA 57. PO Davila reiterated that he did not independently recall threatening to arrest § 87(2)(b) but stated that § 87(2)(b) could have been arrested for disorderly conduct because he was yelling and cursing at PO Bomparola and PO Davila, as well as balling his hands into fists and shaking them.

NYS Penal § 240.20 (BR 15) states that a person is guilty of disorderly conduct if they intend to inconvenience, raise alarm, or create risk to the public. In an individual, for instance, engaged in violent or threatening behavior, then they would be guilty of disorderly conduct.

In People v. Gonzalez, 25 N.Y.3d 1100, the court found no evidence that defendant's rant against police officers constituted disorderly conduct, as the legal statute requires a situation that extends beyond the exchange between the individual disputants to a point where it becomes a potential or immediate public problem (BR 19).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (P) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Allegation (Q) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Davila failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

It is undisputed that neither PO Bomparola nor PO Davila provided § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

PO Bomparola (BR 04) stated that he did not provide a business card to § 87(2)(b) because he did not want to continue the interaction with § 87(2)(b) as it was not safe for him to do so and because PO Bomparola's presence was escalating the situation.

PO Davila (BR 05) testified that he did not provide § 87(2)(b) with his business card and did not state a reason why.

Officers should carry Right to Know business cards and should provide them at the end of the law enforcement activity, except when a summons is issued, arrest is made, or if there are exigent circumstances. New York City Administrative Code § 14-174 (BR 16).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) has been a party to one other CCRB complaint and has been named as a victim in one allegation (BR 11).
 - § 87(2)(b)
- PO Bomparola has been a member of service for six years and has been a subject in 11 other CCRB complaints, six of which have been substantiated.

- CCRB case 201704022 involved substantiated allegations of a frisk, vehicle search, and vehicle stop. The Board recommended Command Discipline A. The NYPD did not impose any penalties.
- CCRB case 201707955 involved a substantiated allegation of refusal to provide name/shield number. The Board recommended Command Level 1 Instructions, which the NYPD imposed.
- CCRB case 201710310 involved substantiated allegations of a frisk and a vehicle search. The Board recommended Command Discipline B. The NYPD imposed Formalized Training.
- PO Davila has been a member of service for five years and has been a subject in four other CCRB complaints, none of which have been substantiated.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This case was not suitable for mediation.
- As of January 14, 2020, the Office of the New York City Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed regarding this incident (BR 12).

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]

Squad No.: 11

Investigator:	<u>Tahreem Khan</u> Signature	<u>Inv. Tahreem Khan</u> Print Title & Name	<u>May 7, 2020</u> Date
---------------	----------------------------------	--	----------------------------

Squad Leader:	<u>Edwin Pena</u> Signature	<u>IM Edwin Pena</u> Print Title & Name	<u>05/07/20</u> Date
---------------	--------------------------------	--	-------------------------

Reviewer:	_____ Signature	_____ Print Title & Name	_____ Date
-----------	--------------------	-----------------------------	---------------